

Remarks

Further and favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks.

Thus, the claims have been amended in response to all of the grounds of rejection under the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. §112, in a manner which renders this rejection moot.

Claim 2 is amended by defining “spectroscopic probe” with reference to page 13, line 12, and deleting “contrasting reagent” and further defining “moiety which is part of a specific binding pair” with reference to page 14, lines 7-8 and 13-14.

Claim 17 is amended by deleting “having a dendritic structure”.

Claim 28 has been rewritten with reference to page 19, lines 4-8 to remove the objections of the Examiner. Furthermore, R₄ in claim 27 has been renamed R₄', since this substituent in the starting material does not correspond directly to R₄ in claim 2 (R₄ in the final product).

In claim 31, “manipulating” and all corresponding language have been deleted.

Thus, all of the grounds of rejection set forth by the Examiner in items 1-9 have been overcome, rendering the rejection moot.

Applicants respectfully submit that these amendments should be entered even though they are being presented after a final rejection, since the effect of the amendments is to moot the rejection and place the application in condition for allowance. Entry of the amendments will not necessitate any further consideration and/or search of the prior art, it being noted that the Office Action does not include any prior art rejections.

Therefore, in view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance, and such allowance is solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Maik KINDERMANN et al.

For: Michael R. Davis
Michael R. Davis
Registration No. 25,134
Attorney for Applicants

By: Amy E. Schmid
Amy E. Schmid
Registration No. 55,965
Attorney for Applicants

MRD/pth
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
October 20, 2008